DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 410 260 TM 027 034

AUTHOR McGill-Franzen, Anne; Ward, Naomi
TITLE Teachers' Stance towards Standards, Frameworks, and Assessments for English Language Arts and Social Studies: The Case of NYS.
PUB DATE Mar 97
NOTE 43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Beginning Reading; *Educational Assessment; Elementary Education; *Elementary School Teachers; *English; Interviews; *Language Arts; Models; *Social Studies; Sociocultural Patterns; *Standards; State Programs; Suburban Schools; Theory Practice Relationship; Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS New York

ABSTRACT

This paper presents the results of a document and interview analysis focusing on the standards and frameworks materials that have been newly developed for teachers and administrators in New York to determine the fit between these guidelines and the developing sociocultural concept of curriculum as "conversation" within the domains of English Language Arts and Social Studies. The study focused on 21 teachers in several schoolwide curriculum projects at kindergarten through grade 4 levels. The first data set consisted of documents from a variety of sources. The second data set included transcribed telephone interviews from 16 urban and 5 suburban teachers. The analyses indicate that the framework documents offered by the state and school districts are not sufficient for teachers to transform the new standards into classroom practice. For example, aside from the documents on the state testing program, there is little guidance on beginning reading development and assessment. In social studies education little instruction as delivered bears any relationship to the state social studies standards. Comparisons across examined standards documents and also statements made of teachers revealed some discontinuities, suggesting a breach in many cases between intended public policy and implementation. Teachers may be caught between conflicting expectations. An appendix presents the New York state standards for social studies. (Contains 1 table, 3 figures, and 14 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 410 260

Teachers' Stance Towards Standards, Frameworks, and Assessments for English Language Arts and Social Studies: The Case of NYS

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Anne McGill-Franzen
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Anne McGill-Franzen & Naomi Ward

University at Albany-SUNY

Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Conference
Chicago, IL, March 26, 1997

TM027134

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The federal government, through the Goals 2000 initiative, funded a number of national standards projects in the content areas, including the National Center for History in the Schools, Geography Education Standards Project, Center for Civic Education and the Standards Project for the English Language Arts. National professional organizations and practicing teachers worked within these projects to reform teaching and learning standards in the content areas.

Several standards projects have published their recommendations, including the National Standards Project of the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) and Standards for the English Language Arts, jointly developed by the International Reading Association and the National Council of Teachers of English (IRA/NCTE). Such documents are intended to initiate wide-ranging discussion and reflection within schools and communities about what students should know and be able to do in the content areas. As explained in Goals 2000: How the New Voluntary National Standards Will Improve Education (US Department of Education, 1994), the standards provide " a focus, not a national curriculum;" they are voluntary, not federal mandates, and they provide "dynamic, not static applications."

Already, many state departments of education, following the early lead of California, have started to create new curriculum and assessment frameworks based in large part on the national standards projects. Teachers and administrators at the local school and district levels are expected, in turn, to interpret these state curriculum and assessment frameworks and translate them into practice. The Goals 2000: Educate America Act is intended to support these state and local efforts to sustain conversation about higher standards and put

into place curriculum and assessment practices that will enable teachers to improve their teaching and students to achieve at higher levels (Hoff, 1997)

This paper presents the results of a document and interview analysis focusing on the standards and frameworks materials that have been newly developed for teachers and administrators in one "lighthouse" state -- New York -- in order to determine (1) the "fit" between these guidelines and the developing sociocultural concept of curriculum as "conversation" (Applebee, 1996; McMahon, 1997) within the domains of English Language Arts and Social Studies, grades K-4 and (2) the practical usefulness of these documents, as perceived by a small number of urban and suburban teachers (N=21) involved in several K-4 school-wide curriculum development projects, in helping them reconceptualize the traditions of teaching,learning and evaluation in these disciplines.

Methodology

There were two primary sources of data in this study: documents and interviews. The first data set (Data Set 1) consisted of documents from a variety of sources, including the New York State Education Department, publications related to standards and assessment from national professional organizations such as the National Council of the Social Studies (NCSS), the International Reading Association (IRA) and the National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), and standards and curriculum projects created by local school districts who participated in the study. The second data set (Data Set 2) included transcribed telephone interviews from 16 teachers, representing three urban school districts that participated in a Goals 2000 teacher inquiry project, and 5 transcribed face-to-face interviews with suburban teachers who are collaborating with the university in a longitudinal research study (Total Number of Interviews=21).

Data Analysis and Interpretation

Data from the evidentiary bases were examined, with attention focused on statements relating to the issues of standards, assessment, and student learning and achievement. Using a method of constant comparison (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), categories were formed and then revised as recurring themes emerged, and new readings and discussion reframed our thinking. Triangulation between data sources and between investigators occurred during this process. As we analyzed the data, we noted divergent patterns embedded within the discourse from the various sources (Mathison, 1988). We interpreted these patterns based on our knowledge and understanding of the contexts of the specific data sources, as well as the social, political and historical context of the phenomena we were investigating.

Document Analysis: National Professional Association Standards and NYS Standards and Curriculum Frameworks and Assessment Documents

Briefly, document analysis suggested that the newly revised New York State curriculum and assessment frameworks for Social Studies (NYS Education Department, June 9, 1995) and English Language Arts (NYS Education Department, January, 1996) are closely aligned with the national standards developed by NCSS and IRA/NCTE respectively. Unlike curricula of the past, the new standards projects define curriculum more as "conversation" than a body of knowledge (Applebee, 1996), a reformulation that is entirely consistent with a sociocultural perspective on development and the role of language in mediating learning. National standards projects recommend experiences and instruction that will not only teach students about past traditions in social studies or literature, but will also enable them to "enter into and participate in [developing traditions] of the present and future" (Applebee, 1996).

Similarly, the NYS frameworks provide standards that emphasize "knowledge-in-use" instead of knowledge "about" Social Studies or English (what Applebee calls "knowledge out-of-context"). Although not explicitly referred to as such, the standards provided in the state frameworks emphasize the rules that govern participation in the respective discourses of Social Studies and English. In Learning Standards for English Language Arts (NYSED, January, 1996), for example, the emphasis is on the *uses* of language -- reading, writing, listening and speaking for information and understanding, for literary response and self-expression, for critical analysis and evaluation, and for effective social interaction. Besides providing standards of knowledge-in-use, the NYS frameworks emphasize interdisciplinary approaches to achieving these standards. The Preliminary Draft Framework for Social Studies (NYSED, June 9, 1995), for example, explicitly states that students must have experiences with "approaches that examine the broad connections of ideas, information, issues, themes, and perspectives across the disciplines" (p.13).

In language that echoes the national standards, the state frameworks define what students should know and be able to do in English Language Arts and Social Studies. However, the national standards projects (at this point) provide neither developmental benchmarks for designing grade level experiences nor appropriate assessments. There is little assistance in selecting culturally significant domains, topics or themes worth studying. In contrast, the NYS frameworks provide limited guidance on why, when and how students might achieve these high standards. Both the Social Studies and the English Language Arts frameworks provide content and performance standards for each of three developmental levels (elementary, intermediate and commencement) with examples of appropriate experiences to help achieve these standards and suitable criteria for evaluating achievement and reporting growth. In addition,

the English Language Arts framework provides a few examples of students' work at each of the three developmental levels.

The state-level assessment program is not clearly aligned with the standards and frameworks in either content domain at this point in time. The state-level assessments in reading are administered at grades 3, 6 and 8; a writing test (150 word imaginary piece; 150 word personal narrative)at grade 5; and a primarily multiple-choice social studies test at grade 6. At present, the reading tests are cloze tests of comprehension of expository text (Degrees of Reading Power). However, the testing program in reading is being completely revised so that by 1999 the ElementaryEnglish Language Arts Assessment at grade 4, based on 4 listening or reading passages and 3 student writings, will replace the 3rd and 6th grade reading tests and the 5th grade writing test. In addition, the 8th grade reading test will be replaced by a test similar in format to that of the revised elementary level test, but the content of the listening, reading and writing tasks will be drawn from the NYS Social Studies standards (NYSED, nd).

Analysis and Interpretations:

Teachers' Interviews and Teachers' Curriculum and Assessment Products

The second issue that we set out to address in the study is whether the standards and frameworks materials were useful to teachers in helping them reconceptualize the traditions of teaching, learning and evaluation. In order to better understand teachers' discussions of standards and assessments, we first described the broader context within which the teachers were working and talking with us about their work. Of the 21 elementary school teachers whose interviews we transcribed, all but five were involved in Goals 2000 projects funded through the federal initiative. These 16 teachers were from three upstate New York small-city and rural districts, and they voluntarily participated in three different Goals 2000 inquiry projects in partnership with the university.

The remaining five teachers presently work in a suburban school located in between the small-cities of the Goals 2000 teachers and they are current first-year collaborators with the university in an integrated curriculum development study.

At the outset of the study, we divided the 21 teachers into four groups according to district affiliation and type of inquiry project:

Group 1: Tannersville Primary Grade Teachers (N=7)

Group 2: Factory City Elementary Teachers (N=7)

Group 3: Hudson Falls Primary Teachers (N=2)

Group 4: Southtown Elementary Teachers (N=5)

The Goals 2000 projects took place in the spring of 1996; we interviewed these teachers the following fall. We interviewed the teacher collaborators the following spring. The interview protocol (See appendix) did not focus narrowly on teachers' interpretations of standards and assessments, but also the broader topics of structures for professional development, challenges to beliefs and practices, and descriptions of day to day teaching and learning within their respective classrooms.

Interviews. We identified within these transcribed interviews any discussions about standards, assessments, and curriculum development in English Language Arts and Social Studies, including probes for teachers' specific knowledge of NYS standards, frameworks, and assessments. We then analyzed these identified segments of the transcripts for categories or themes to describe teachers' thinking about higher standards and/or frameworks for curriculum and assessment. We paid particular attention to patterns across the four groups of teachers in the following areas : teachers' reactions to or stances toward the call for "higher standards" and relatedly, the influence of recently drafted NYS standards in Social Studies and English Language Arts on teachers' self-reported instructional practices and assessments.

Using constant comparative analysis, we identified four categories of teachers' responses in the interview segments: reflective or evaluative comments on experiences with the standards or particular practices related to the standards; comments that clearly indicate that the speaker has interpreted the standard (or the revised curriculum and assessment practice related to the standard) as a professional responsibility that she has undertaken; comments that indicate the standard (or related practice) is either the parents' responsibility or that of the district administration, and not under her personal or professional control.

Next, we developed a descriptive narrative of each teacher group, and within these narratives, contrasted the four groups in terms of their stance toward the standards, (1) in terms of responsibility for the outcomes of high stakes tests (3rd grade PEPs) and (2) their views of themselves as participants in the discourse, if you will, of curriculum and assessment development in English Language Arts and Social Studies (See Table). Although a few teachers identified parents as having some responsibility for the educational outcomes of children's schooling, teachers overwhelmingly assumed responsibility for children's achievement, particularly on the high stakes tests. However, whether teachers also assumed responsibility for innovative curriculum and assessment development depended, in large part if not entirely, on whether the district gave them the authority to do so.

Two of the districts, both low-resource, were also highly authoritarian: each mandated a particular curriculum and materials, and one of these also mandated standardized tests at each grade level; the other also mandated particular grouping practices. Teachers working within these constraints acknowledged the districts' authority and concommitant responsibility for developing curriculum and assessment. The teachers themselves pursued Goals 2000 projects that left central authority and responsibility structures intact, as we

described in the narratives. Two other districts, one with ample resources and the other quite limited in resources, encouraged teachers either explicitly (in the former case) or by default (in the latter case) to develop alternative assessments or curriculum frameworks. Finally, we examined the specific products of the teachers' inquiry and/or curriculum and assessment projects (and additionally, in one case, the teacher- reported district guidelines that shape day by day curriculum and assessment practices) for language that connects the state frameworks to teachers' thinking.

Curriculum and assessment projects. In addition to an analysis of teachers' interviews, we examined the curriculum and assessment products of the 16 teachers' Goals 2000 projects, as published in their final reports, and other district documents, which teachers identified in the interviews and to which teachers' said they refer for guidance in curriculum and assessment practices, in order to determine the influence of the state standards documents on teachers' work. Similarly, for the 5 teacher collaborators, we examined the curriculum and assessment guidelines identified by the teachers and produced by their school's instructional councils in English Language Arts and Social Studies for language linking these local products to the state standards documents.

It is within the Goals 2000 teachers' retrospective views of their inquiry projects, or in the case of the teachers who are university collaborators, the teachers' ongoing engagement in the curriculum and development work of their school, that we interpreted their responses to state standards and curriculum frameworks and assessments in social studies and English language arts. Thus, in the narratives that follow, we briefly described the four groups in terms of district demographics and district policies, as well as teachers' inquiry projects and patterns of teachers' interview responses to the press for higher standards.

In the sections that follow the narratives we summarized for each teacher group our analysis and interpretations framed by these two questions:

(1) What do these teachers say about their experiences applying the standards to their own practices?

(2) How do the local products of teachers' curriculum and assessment development relate to the standards?

Group 1 Narrative: Tannersville Primary Teachers

Tannersville is a small, primarily White working class town that used to be the center of a flourishing leather finishing and manufacturing industry. The demise of the leather factories left the city without an industrial base. The rural school district reflects the hard times of the city -- little income or property wealth to support an increasingly needy population. Faced with declining scores on the NYS Pupil Evaluation Program (PEP) third grade reading tests, the administration publicly told third grade teachers to "get their PEPs up." When the opportunity arose for Tannersville high-poverty schools to participate in the Goals 2000 initiative, seven K-2 teachers from one school volunteered.

These teachers felt that their practices were being unfairly targeted by third grade teachers who had increasing numbers of children unable to meet the state's minimum standard ("People point fingers at teachers of younger kids" [bs]). The K-2 teachers wanted to revisit the school district's policy on retention, which was unclear, so that they could hold back children unlikely to pass the PEPs at third grade. They had interpreted "higher standards" in terms of higher standards for students in the form of a promotional gates policy. Because retention was not a solution sanctioned by the administration, one teacher volunteered to follow up on retained children from their school to determine if it "worked:"

> I volunteered to look up information, interview their teachers, and do a study on kids who were retained. I found that retaining students has not helped them find success and they are still at the bottom of their repeated class. [sg]

Although the teacher's study did not convince all teachers, most teachers were moved by the voices of the children and parents to reconsider their recommendations or at least, as one teacher said, "watch closely what's happening with the child I retained."[ph] The retention study and the "outside pressure" from the district to "get their PEPs up" prompted teachers to "explore other options." [gm]

Teachers decided that they wanted some form of early intervention for low-achieving children above and beyond the remedial, speech, special education and summer school services already provided. After unprecedented discussion between support teachers and classroom teachers ("I have never before worked with a Language Arts person" [bs]), the teachers decided that the classroom instruction that was already taking place, and the summer school that was scheduled to take place, needed to be more intensive and appropriately focused on individual students. However, the teachers "did not know what an instructional level really is" [gm], nor were they able to use the assessments currently in place in the school. Other than the state 3rd grade PEPs, the support teachers did all the testing of individuals for their various programs, and many of these assessments were "worthless because they didn't help [classroom] teaching." [gm] Through the Goals 200 initiative, the teachers determined more appropriate ways of assessing children to improve classroom instruction. Speaking for other teachers as well as herself, one teacher described the Tannersville Goals 2000 project thus:

> We looked at the school to see what was really needed. To fine tune our early intervention was the goal we expressed, but we ourselves looked at our own teaching, our own needs, our own goals. The benchmarks we developed are ways of expressing these... The [performance-based] assessments told us a true picture of what the children are able to do... It eventually led to early intervention, but we had to take a few steps backwards first." [gm]

Without knowledge of curriculum-based assessments, teachers were unable to determine appropriate interventions or improve their own instructional practices. The teachers studied the NYS Standards in English Language Arts as well as curriculum and assessment guidelines prepared by other districts. Through analyses of these documents, the teachers identified ways of evaluating children's literacy development in the primary grades. They created a hierarchy of benchmarks for each grade level, along with potential sources of evidence to assess the progress of each child. They aligned the benchmarks with state standards and provided a list of trade books at varying levels of complexity to help connect the assessment process to classroom language arts curricula that was becoming increasingly literature-based.

<u>What do these teachers say about their experiences applying the standards to their own practices?</u>

They say that the impetus to revise their current curriculum and assessment practices was outside pressure for accountability. The mandate to improve high stakes test scores thrust upon them by district administrators and the grousing of upper-grade colleagues prompted these primary grade teachers to examine their own practices in retention, assessment and curriculum. The NYS Standards as well as the interpretation of these standards by teachers in other districts helped Tannersville teachers to revise their practices, and in some

cases, their beliefs. It is clear, however, that not all teachers participated in the discussions at the same level, or with the same degree of comfort. Three of the seven teachers indicated that they "had to do more of the thinking" and "no one told us, 'This is where we need to go.' " They viewed the standards as too vague and "wanted someone to tell me what to do." On the other hand, working with the standards gave other teachers renewed feelings of efficacy ("I believe that all children can learn and I can help them do just that" [jp]) and prompted many reflective comments by some teachers on accountability:

"I realize I need to set a standard for myself, whether or not the results are what I expected" [jp];

"Teachers need to be forced to read or they won't keep up" [cj];

"Grade level standards are good because they'll help teachers focus" [cj];

"Teachers need more support to do new things" [sg]

Most valued, however, was the opportunity to participate in the dialogue about standard-setting with colleagues. The process of collaboration to develop local interpretations offered Tannersville teachers a forum for their ideas and a chance to reflect on the implications of their work:

"Presenting to colleagues forced me to review what I'm doing as well" [jp];

"I'm at a different point in my knowledge" [jp];

"Teachers are now coordinating their work with the same goal in mind" [bs]).

Two of the teachers differed with their colleagues on whether standards should be set at a mastery level for children ("Standards are a point to aim for but you can't expect mastery" [bs]; "Many kids will not meet grade level standards" [rp]).

The idea of using standards as a frame of reference for curriculum and assessment work was new to all the teachers. None of the teachers were familiar with the NYS Standards in English Language Arts before their participation in Goals 2000, and at the time of the interviews, none were familiar with the NYS Standards in Social Studies.

How is the Tannersville Goals 2000 inquiry project related to the state standards?

A comparison of the language of the Tannersville Goals 2000 project with the language of the NYS Standards in English Language Arts suggested close adherence to the state documents in terms of process and content:

A "Performance Indicator" under Standard 1, Elementary Level, from the New York State Department of Education's Learning Standards for English Language Arts:

> Students make appropriate and effective use of strategies to construct meaning from print, such as prior knowledge about a subject, structural and context clues, and an understanding about letter-sound relationships to decode difficult words.

From Goals, Benchmarks, and Performance Assessments, K-2 (November, 1996), a Goals 2000 Inquiry Project of the Tannersville School District:

Kindergarten: Writers/Speakers

Kindergarten Students Will:

Language Arts Goals	Grade Level Benchmarks	Performance Assessments
Understand that writing is a means of communication	• use pictures and print to convey a message • write upper and lower case letters • use sound spelling • use language experiences, dramatic expression, music and movement • respond to literature and experience	• anecdotal records • word lists • K-1 Assessment Pilot • journals • audio/video tapes • writing samples • dramatic interpretations • discussions

Tannersville teachers went beyond the standards documents in that they created an assessment system for documenting children's progress at beginning developmental levels, an area where the state has thus far provided little direction. Unlike the proposed new state testing program, the high stakes PEP testing program is not consistent with NYS English Language Arts Standards. No doubt, the collaborative nature of the Goals 2000 inquiry projects helped to support the Tannersville teachers in their study of alternative assessment that met their requirements for curriculum-based assessment and compatibility with the states revised testing program.

Group 2 Narrative: Factory City Elementary Teachers

Factory City is an example of the quintessential rust-belt town that has lost its industrial base. Once the home to manufacturing giants, Factory City's largest employer has all but closed down its facility, leaving the city itself virtually impoverished and unable to provide even basic services to its residents. The school system has experienced a similar decline: it had the dubious distinction of two years ago being the lowest achieving district of its type on the high stakes reading PEP tests. Currently, between 14 - 22% of the elementary students do not meet the state reference point for minimal development in reading. Approximately 60% of the 8,000 children are eligible for free or reduced lunch; linguistic and ethnic minorities comprise 33% of the school population.

Given the opportunity to participate in the Goals 2000 initiative, seven teachers from Factory City volunteered. Like Tannersville, Factory City teachers are under pressure to improve their PEP scores ("If the kids don't do well, the first thing they look at is what isn't working in your room" [dr])

Like Tannersville, there is little in the way of an assessment system for classroom teachers beyond the 3rd grade PEP tests. Teachers reported that their

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

own observations of children's ability are the basis for the District Report Cards and although writing samples are collected in a portfolio and passed from grade to grade, no systematic evaluation is performed on the students' work. Content area assessment used to be "textbook unit tests" according to one teacher, who is now using "more formats for higher level skills such as compare/contrast" [cm].

Further, unlike Tannersville, the Factory City school administration manages most aspects of classroom life -- from the Joplin reading groups to the mandated 20 year-old phonics program Assured Readiness for Learning (ARL) and district basal textbooks-- leaving teachers little autonomy in curriculum and assessment decisions. The District also created its own interpretations of the NYS Standards for all content areas and distributed these booklets to teachers at each grade level, K-5. The motivation for participating in the Goals 2000 inquiry project for the Factory City teachers was a chance to learn about literature-based instruction from colleagues and university advisors, to adapt trade-book instruction to the level of struggling readers, many of whom are learning English as a Second Language (ESL), and to buy books with the discretionary funds.

In order to develop their Goals 2000 project, Factory City teachers observed teachers in other districts using trade books; they invited teachers to observe their classrooms and offer suggestions; they studied publishers' book samples and book catalogues; they surveyed the children's interests in the basal textbooks stories; and they planned and brainstormed with each other about aspects of their program that they wanted to change.

Ultimately, the teachers identified one or two themes around which they purchased a range of trade books, including predictable books suitable for the emergent reader and ESL student, and basal textbook stories favored by their students. They integrated the writing workshop part of their school day with these trade-book themes or genres, and they adapted the long-running ARL

phonics to include key words and high frequency vocabulary displayed in a word wall. In order to leave the mandated Joplin groups intact (for the mandated basal textbook reading program) and yet integrate the reading program with the writing, they together planned reading/writing workshops with the same trade-book selections, same wall words and key word patterns to take place at the same time of day. With heroic cooperation among teachers, and without disrupting the District's mandates, the Factory City group managed to introduce literature, in the form of trade books of varying levels of difficulty, into their curriculum, and they connected the reading part of their day (except for the cross-grade Joplin basal textbook groups) with writing and word study. That accomplished, they began to look for ways to document the progress they assumed children would make within a more connected curriculum framework ("We are getting into [curriculum frameworks and assessments] that will support the standards" [rmm]).

The Goals 2000 initiative was itself established to facilitate educational improvement, and the forum of these particular projects encouraged Factory City teachers to engage teachers from other districts in a dialogue about effective curriculum and assessment practices. Because the District's mandates were themselves so hide-bound, the opportunity for interaction with other teachers was appreciated, as is evident from comments by two of the teachers ("Collegiality helps and so does a shared work ethic" [jenp]; "Continuous study allowed me to grow professionally" [rmm]) One teacher in particular, the least experienced of the seven, used the language of "high literacy" and professional responsibility to reflect on her goals for the children she teaches:

> I want [to teach so that] kids see themselves as readers and writers [with] purpose for writing and sharing books. I want kids to be learners -- to write, explore, see connections, see relations, see ways to bring ideas

together-- but not because I tell them to. I want to develop more world awareness in kids... I want to find out how they think [jenp].

What do Factory City teachers say about their experiences applying the standards to their own practices?

Factory City teachers made no specific reference to District standards in the Goals 2000 integrated curriculum projects that they developed. In fact, the District standards separate "Writing" from "Reading and Literature," whereas the expressed purpose of the teachers' Goals 2000 project was to relate the processes within a single block of time. Teachers' made reference to the standards (presumably the District standards) to answer specific interview questions about standards.

Because the District already published and promulgated grade-level standards, reportedly based on the NYS Standards documents, teachers were either unaware of the existence of standards different from the District's (this was particularly the case with social studies) or, more likely, they assumed that the District's standards closely reflected those published by the state or were one and the same document ("The District used the state standards and came up with grade level standards" [dd]; "The school has developed a core curriculum guide based on the standards but with curriculum objectives" [df]; "The District has their own frameworks" [cm]).

Five of the seven Factory City teachers said that they had copies of the District curriculum frameworks; one teacher had a copy of the NYS Standards in English Language Arts (but she had not read it), and no teacher had any knowledge of the NYS Standards in Social Studies. It can be assumed then, that the teachers' reflective, and often conflicting, comments about the standards applies to those published by the District and are not based on the discussant's actual experiences with state standards. Factory City teachers said that the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

standards were too broad (N=2); too vague (N=1); too difficult to understand (N=1). One teacher felt that "parents can use standards to compare what every first grader needs to know whether they are in a suburban or a city school" [dd] and, conversely, another thought that the standards would confuse parents ("parents don't understand -- they are so used to seeing specifics and grades" [df]. Several teachers viewed standards as "valuable" for themselves because "they give you a direction to go towards" [df] and the document is a "guide to where kids need to be" and "shows what needs to be taught" [dd]

> Equity was introduced as an issue by only one teacher who asked:
>
> How can you expect kids miles apart to meet the same standards at the same age? I believe all kids can learn but you start off with such wide differences it doesn't seem fair. [rmm]

Other teachers (N=2) suggested that parents bear some responsibility for children's school achievement and that there is a "huge difference in the ability of children to achieve" [cmart] when parents work with them and when they do not.

Teachers in general did not feel a need to clarify standards that were seen as too broad, vague, or difficult. One teacher noted that teachers "don't understand they are already accomplishing the standards in their classrooms" [df]; another teacher suggested that the District provide inservice on their frameworks, and another teacher flatly said "I am not sure what I am supposed to do with the standards"[cmart].

<u>How is the Factory City District curriculum frameworks related to the state standards?</u>

We illustrate the discontinuity between the Factory City frameworks on the one hand, and the state standards, on the other with an example from the

domain of social studies (See appendix for another example from the domain of language arts).

A "Key Idea" under Standard 1, Elementary Level, from the New York State Department of Education's Learning Standards for Social Studies:

> Important ideas, social and cultural values, beliefs, and traditions from New York State and United States history illustrate the connections and interactions of people and events across time and from a variety of perspectives.

From Elementary Education in Factory City (September, 1996), a publication of the Factory City School District; Grade 3, Social Studies:

Major areas of study will include:

- defining a community
- determining how lifestyle in a community is influenced by environmental and geographic factors
- comparing rural, urban, and suburban communities in the US and around the world
- learning abut the traditions of different communities
- assessing the need for rules in a community and the government process
- studying the economic needs of a community
- improving map and graph skills
- reporting on current affairs
- developing good citizenship skills

The Factory City document reflects a "expanding communities" curriculum rather than the state standard (Standard 1: History of the United States and New York). It was, in fact, difficult to identify which state standard of the five (See appendix) might be most closely related to the Factory City third grade course of study. Clearly, there is not a strong relationship between the key ideas developed in the NYS standard and the district's interpretation. The major areas of study identified in the Factory City document appear to be "activities" rather than curriculum concepts.

Viewing these as activities, and contrasting them with the sample tasks associated with one performance indicator (out of three) in the NYS document underscored the lack of depth and connectedness in the Factory City activities. The first performance indicator under the NYS standard was to "gather and organize information about the traditions transmitted by various groups living in their neighborhood and community" (p.2). To accomplish this, students might

> ... conduct interviews with family members, collect family memorabilia such as letters, diaries, stories photographs, and keepsakes; classify information by type: social, political, economic, cultural, or religious, discuss how traditions and practices were passed from one generation to the next; and determine the extent to which the traditions and practices are shared by other members of the class. (p.2)

The above text represents but one set of sample tasks, out of four sets, that might help students meet the performance criteria. Obviously, the District standards document used by the teachers, and referred to frequently in our interviews, bears little resemblance to the NYS Standards document in Social Studies. The Factory City document clearly is impoverished in what it offered teachers compared to the document prepared by the state. Given the fact that the District mandated many critical aspects of instruction and learning in Factory City classrooms, including what teachers interpreted as the breadth and depth of their curriculum, the inadequacy of the District's document is striking.

Group 3 Narrative: Hudson Falls Primary Grade Teachers

Hudson Falls is a mid-sized mill town where generations of European ethnic immigrants found employment. Abandoned textile mills and company homes line the banks of the Hudson now, but the streets still bear the names of prominent German and French families who settled there. The school district has

experienced financial hard times as well, although this small urban area is a stable, working class community where many of the District's teachers and administrators still live. Like Factory City and Tannersville, the population of children served by the schools is becoming increasingly diverse (about 4% minority) and low-achieving just as the District is losing resources to support them. Currently, about 63% of the roughly 2,000 children are eligible for free or reduced lunch.

Hudson Falls teachers volunteered for the Goals 2000 program in order to search out effective ways to deal with diverse learners. Because the range of development is so wide in these teachers' classrooms, they felt inadequate to meet the needs of all the children. Thus, the teachers were exploring organizational strategies for dealing with developmental differences, such as multi-age classrooms and "looping." Like Factory City, Hudson Falls administrators exert strong control over classroom instruction., including the publication of District Grade Level Curriculum Guidelines and the administration of standardized tests at each grade level.

What do Hudson Falls teachers say about their experiences applying the standards to their own practices?

The most noteworthy feature of Hudson Falls teachers responses to the standards, both state and District versions, is their almost total lack of interest in them. One teacher had no knowledge of the NYS Standards in either English Language Arts or Social Studies and said that if the District wanted to develop teachers' awareness of them, it was the District's responsibility to "disseminate information to teachers, tell teachers what they expect in terms of the use of these documents in their classroom" and provide staff development [bs]. The second teacher had listened to the Commissioner's broadcast about the standards but said that the "reality is that it's not going to happen." She felt that the idea of

100% mastery of the standards was out of the question because "there is not enough support for teachers, parents or students to accomplish the goals of the standards" [nb] The only change that this teacher predicted for the elementary level was "testing."

What the Hudson Falls teachers have in common with the Factory City teachers is that both groups of teachers work under curriculum mandates. Unlike the Factory City teachers who revised their curriculum to achieve more connectedness and flexibility (while adhering to the mandates), the Hudson Falls teachers instead revised the organizational structures of their classrooms to accomplish the same purposes. The state curriculum frameworks wer e not seen as relevant in a Districts with already prescribed curriculum guidelines for each grade level.

Group 4 Narrative: Southtown Elementary Grade Teachers

Southtown is a relatively large suburban town situated between two small cities. Although not as diverse as the small city communities that surround it, Southtown serves a more economically (16% free and reduced lunch eligibility) and ethnically (about 8% minority) diverse student population of approximately 5,500 than might be predicted from its generally stellar performance on the NYS PEPs and its status as a suburban district. The Southtown elementary teachers represent grades 1-4 within one school building. They are collaborators with university faculty in a long-term research project on integrated curriculum and assessment. Besides their role as teacher collaborators, these teachers are actively involved in the curriculum and assessment work of their school and District. For example, several belong to District's instructional councils in both English Language Arts and Social Studies. There is no mandated District curriculum at this time.

The interview data that we present here was collected at the start of the Southtown teachers' collaboration on an integrated curriculum and assessment research project (within the first semester). Both the "language arts assessment K-1" and the "writing pilot," to which teachers refer in their interviews, are projects that the teachers undertook before their involvement with the university. The "language arts K-1 assessment" and the "writing pilot" are recent products of the Language Arts Instructional Council. The Social Studies Instructional Council is in the process of reviewing social studies textbooks and making recommendations for the purchase of a textbook for third grade.

There is no social studies textbook currently being used by primary grade teachers, much to the discomfort of several teachers. Teachers hold that without a textbook, "social studies is not really defined" [cc]; "we get isolated -- we don't have a textbook that says "we're going to do this" [ms]. Rather, teachers must ask themselves "what do you think the children are in need of knowing? I wasn't given specific topics " [ms]. This same first grade teacher questions whether she is doing enough social studies or too much:

> Am I throwing too much information at them? How much can they handle? Is there a better way to get across information? I don't think there has been a lot of work done in social studies at the primary level. I want to know what teachers in other districts are doing. [ms]

As noted earlier, the Instructional Council in Social Studies is considering the purchase of a new text for third grade (the copyright date on the current text is 1978). A 3rd grade Southtown teacher expressed feelings that were very similar to those of the primary grade teachers who work without a textbook: "I feel tied to the textbook, afraid that I'm not going to give them the information that they are required to have. If it's covered in the textbook, it's really important" [sbern].

In language arts, teachers have a basal textbook available as well as money for trade books. Second grade teachers have to use basal assessments because the Instructional Council has not completed its work on alternative assessments beyond K-1 in reading. In addition, teachers in grades 2-4 administer the California Test of Basic Skills (CTBS). Some teachers feel that children need both types of assessments ("I feel responsible for teaching these children how to take a standardized test because ...that is how they are judged in life" but "we try to fit in authentic assessment whenever we can" [msant]). An alternative writing assessment K-4, developed by the teachers, is being piloted and revised this year. Although the writing pilot has received generally good reviews, teachers are revising the rubric for the emergent writing scale ("I want to make it longer" [cc])and collaborating to make scoring more reliable ("There are a lot more discrepancies in the way the writing portfolio is graded" [ms]). One of the teachers who "created" the writing pilot wanted to make the administration of the tasks "less overwhelming" [cc].

As in the other three districts, public accountability for high test scores is seen as an important responsibility by teachers. Teachers believe that administrators in Southtown want the schools to look good and teachers to be "accountable for children's learning"[msant] :

> The administration is supportive of multiage and new spelling [programs] but [we] still need the test scores... The administration uses our test scores [to see] if we get new funds from the district...
>
> We are compared teacher to teacher, grade level to grade level, building to building... [bp].

> They are continuing with standardized tests because they want to know how does your class, your school, your district rate among the other districts? [ms]

> When we go to the taxpayers [for more money] we need to be accountable [msant].

What do Southtown teachers say about their experiences applying the standards to their own practices?

Just as curriculum analysts Brophy (1992) and Ladson-Billings (1996) have noted in their studies of social science education, teachers do not give equal time to all content areas. One Southtown teacher noted that the "big push to increase standards" constrains teachers' time and sets up competing priorities even in first grade:

> We have a big focus on K, 1, and 2 so that we don't have children that get to 3rd grade ... still struggling to read... Some teachers feel we don't have time for science or social studies, but if you integrate it, you can teach it...What I need to look at is what are the children supposed to know, how can I find the materials and use my language arts time and my writing time to teach? [ms]

The Language Arts Instructional Council, which created both the K-1 assessment and the writing pilot "worked off the state frameworks" but "we wanted to make it fit into the classroom:"

> The state framework says that children should write for understanding so we gave people choices that will meet the standards. If you give too much, then they don't want to do it anyway... I helped to create it and I feel a little overwhelmed sometimes. [cc]

Looking back on the development of these assessment systems, a first grade teacher and member of the council said it was difficult to separate the language processes from one another for purposes of curriculum development ("Reading, writing, listening, speaking...I have a hard time breaking them all apart" [cc]). Nonetheless, all Southtown teachers were familiar with the NYS Language Arts Standards and anxious to demonstrate their points with specific reference to the reading and writing assessments that they helped develop, as in the following example:

> Let me pull out first grade... This would be for information and understanding ... and the last standard is for social interaction which would be like writing to a pen pal...[cc]

They explained that an assessment "should be a tool" rather than a "grade that just tells you the final outcome" [ms]. Most of the assessment, according to one teacher, is "driven by the four state language arts standards" [msant].

Southtown teachers were not as familiar with the NYS Social Studies standards as they were for English Language Arts. Several had no first-hand knowledge of Social Studies while others just could not remember what they were:

> I know it is out there... they started with one thing and then theychanged it, and I don't really remember much about either-- how the changed it or what it was before or what it is now... [sbern].

Instead of using a District or state curriculum framework in social studies, primary grade teachers defined as a group "topics that we think are interesting" [cc]. They brainstorm and "pull together" ideas, and this becomes the curriculum for children within the grade level. Teachers identified social studies concepts that they believe are confusing for children, for example, concepts of time, state, and country: "Children are confused about the world... [they

thought] that the photos of the people of Nicaragua were from long-ago"...that "letters all in Spanish" could not originate in the USA, and that the state of Minnesota couldn't be home to inner city children. Children were surprised that their pen pals from the same country could have cultural experiences that are substantively different from the mainstream.

Because social studies materials with depth of content were perceived as too difficult for primary grade children to read, these teachers suggested that they themselves should select read-aloud books to help develop conceptual relationships and cultural understandings, and using their language arts frameworks, have children "create their own texts" [cc] for reading and discussion. Upper grade teachers were less comfortable with this teacher-defined social studies curriculum -- therefore, the current mission of the Instructional Council in Social Studies to review textbooks at the 3rd grade level.

So, in spite of their close readings of the NYS Language Arts Standards and strong collaboration with each other to develop District frameworks consistent with student-centered approaches to curriculum, Southtown teachers were by no means a compliant group or homogeneous in their thinking. One teacher expressed the concern of all five teachers when she questioned the authority of people "out there" telling others what to teach:

> Who's devising the standards? Who decides this is what children are going to learn? Or this is an accurate measure? [ms]

In their view, and that of the administration, the primary work of the Instructional Councils was to interpret the state standards from the perspective of classroom teachers so that the implementation of the K-1 Alternative Assessments, for example, actually improved teaching and learning in Southtown. Teachers who participated in their councils spoke frequently about the need to revisit and revise their newly developed curriculum and assessment

frameworks in light of children's responses and the experiences of their colleagues.

How are the Southtown K-1 Language Arts Assessment and K-4 Writing Pilot related to the state standards and curriculum frameworks?

Several Southtown teachers served on the Instructional Council that created the "writing pilot," a curriculum and assessment document that each one of the teachers referred to at some point in our interviews. Teachers are using the document for the first time this year, and their comments during the interviews reflected their on-going evaluation of the utility of the processes, rubrics and anchor papers in documenting children's written language development.

The teachers developed two tasks to evaluate children's development within the four NYS Language Arts Standards. For example, at the first grade level, children can either write about a topic of interest to inform others or write about something you and your family do together (Language for Information and Understanding: Standard 1). To assess children's use of Language for Literary Response & Expression (Standard 2), they can write and share with the class either a new ending of a story they have read or listened to or a personal experience that relates to a story they have read or listened to. To demonstrate Language for Critical Analysis & Evaluation (Standard 3), children can write either a letter to a friend to convince him to read a specific book and the reasons why; or they can write an explanation to their teacher describing why something (a particular food, place, etc.) is a favorite of theirs. Children can demonstrate their use of Language for Social Interaction by writing a thank you note for an actual experience or write to a pen pal or school buddy about something that happened at school. Teachers constructed rubrics for judging the proficiency of the writing -- for teachers and for students self-evaluation. Teachers gathered annotated anchor papers, or exemplars, at each grade level and at each level of

proficiency, to illustrate the dimensions of writing development that they consider important.

Taking just one of the NYS Standards and the accompanying explanatory documentation by NYS Department of Education (March, 1996) -- Written communication for social interaction -- and comparing it to the teacher-constructed standard (Language for Social Interaction) demonstrates that the NYSED and Southtown Instructional Council clearly defined this standard in similar ways and used similar performance indicators and sample tasks to measure development. According to the NYSED, the "key idea" of this standard "requires using written messages to establish, maintain, and enhance personal relationships with others." Children can show they know how to do this by exchanging notes, cards and letters with friends, family and pen pals; by adjusting their writing for audience, purpose and the knowledge and interests of the recipient of the message; and by reading, discussing and sharing letters, diaries, and journals to learn the conventions of social writing. NYSED provides language that indicates performance indicators and sample tasks, just as the teacher s do, and both sets of standards and tasks foreground similarly important dimensions of written language and social interaction.

Conclusions

Our analyses of teacher interview data suggest that the framework documents alone are not sufficient for teachers to transform the new standards into classroom practice. Aside from the state testing program in reading that commences in grade 3 (which is not consistent with the revised English Language Arts Framework), there is, for example, very little guidance on beginning reading development and assessment. Some teachers, with support from their districts (like the high resource Southtown District) or outside initiatives like Goals 2000, construct their own curriculum and assessment

frameworks that are consistent with national and state frameworks and responsive to a student-centered perspective. In our study, the Southtown, Tannersville and Factory City teachers were able to collaborate with each other, circumvent limitations imposed by few resources or district mandates, and accomplish these objectives in English language arts.

In social studies education, there is virtually little or no instruction in the primary grades that bears any relationship to the NYS Social Studies Standards, according to our interpretations of the teachers' interviews, and no state (or District) program evaluation until grade 6. Although teachers viewed integrated instruction as a positive alternative to a fragmented curricula, they typically interpreted "integration" to mean treating language arts in a more holistic fashion, an approach consistent with the NYS Language Arts Standards, rather than exploring topic or content domains from multiple perspectives, in greater depth, or using the inquiry tools of another discipline.

A second purpose of our study was to examine the fit between a sociocultural perspective on teaching and learning, on the one hand, and the language of the new national and state curriculum and assessment frameworks, the thinking of teachers displayed in their transcribed interviews with us, and the curriculum and assessment documents that teachers collaboratively developed (or used) in response to the press for higher standards, on the other hand. We examined standards documents from these various sources, including those published by national professional organizations such as The National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS), the New York State Education Department, and local school districts. Comparisons across these documents, and also to statements made by teachers, revealed some discontinuities, suggesting a breach in some cases, between intended public policy and implementation. In the illustrations that follow, we attempt to show the connections, or absence of

continuity, between national, state, and locally developed standards in English language arts.

The language of the IRA/NCTE (International Reading Association and the National Council of Teachers of English) Standards for the English Language Arts, for example, is explicitly learner centered. The following texts are from the Professional Summary of the Standards for English Language Arts:

> The perspective that informs the English Language Arts Standards...places the learner at the core. Because the standards are learner-centered, they focus on the ways in which **students actively participate in their learning,** acquire knowledge, shape experience, and respond to their own particular needs and goals through the language arts. (IRA/NCTE , 1996)

Standard 11 from the IRA/NCTE Standards states that:

> **Students participate** as knowledgeable, reflective, creative, and critical members of a variety of literacy communities. (IRA/NCTE , 1996)

The emphasis in these texts is on the student as an active participant, a collaborator in the construction of knowledge in the classroom, and a contributor to the discourse in the domain of literacy. In our interviews, some teachers, reflecting on how standards can be used in their classrooms, showed a shift from the above interpretation to a different, more constrained one of what standards mean in practice. Teachers from two of the small city school districts, Factory City and Hudson Falls, in particular, and to a lesser extent, Tannersville, focused on issues of accountability, authority, and responsibility, away from the learner-centered perspective. The following teachers' statements suggested this shift:

> "We've taken goals and outcomes of what we'd like to see happen in first grade."
>
> "Standards are so vague."
>
> "I worked on writing tasks to use for practice with students before they take the fourth grade PEPS."

"I worked with first grade teachers to set up objectives and assessments for each standard."

"Grade level standards are good because they will help teachers focus."

"I am not sure what I am supposed to do with the standards"

"The reality of looking at such a broad-based goal is the details--the steps are missing"

We believe these disparate interpretations stem from the tension between the standards, which are founded on a view of language and learning which is social in nature, and teachers' stances, which are grounded in real life experiences of being held accountable for student's learning, and in the cases of Hudson Falls and Factory City, being given little authority to revise the curriculum and assessment frameworks that they are required to implement. To illustrate this point, we note below the successive interpretations of one language arts standard (See appendix for interpretations of the same standard by teachers in Tannersville and Southtown). The first is a standard developed by the national professional organizations, the second interpretation is that of the state, and the final, that of Factory City:

Standard 3 from the IRA/NCTE Standards:

> Students apply a wide range of strategies to comprehend, interpret, evaluate, and appreciate texts. They draw on their prior experience, their interactions with other readers and writers, their knowledge of word meaning and other texts, their word identification strategies, and their understanding of textual features (e.g., sound-letter correspondence, sentence structure, context, graphics). (Standards for the English Language Arts, 1996)

A "Key Idea" under Standard 1, Elementary Level, from the New York State Department of Education's Learning Standards for English Language Arts:

Listening and reading to acquire information and understanding involves collecting data, facts, and ideas; discovering relationships, concepts, and generalizations; and using knowledge from oral, written , and electronic sources.

Selected performance indicators for the above key idea are as follows:

- gather and interpret information from references, electronic bulletin boards, interviews, charts, maps and diagrams
- select information appropriate to the purpose of the investigation and relate ideas from one text to another
- select and use strategies for note-taking, organizing, and categorizing
- ask questions to extend and clarify meanings
- make appropriate and effective use of strategies to construct meaning from print, such as prior knowledge about a subject, structural and context clues, and an understanding about letter-sound relationships to decode difficult words
- support inferences about information and ideas with reference to text features, such as vocabulary and organizational patterns.

From Elementary Education in Factory City (September, 1996), a publication of the Factory City School District; Grade 4, Reading and Literature:

Major areas of study will include:

- applying study skills including use of reference books and interpretation of diagrams, charts, and graphs
- expanding vocabulary, decoding, and phonics skills

Thus, curriculum and assessment frameworks developed according to student centered goals and social constructivist theory may contrast sharply with "the belief system associated with assessment, particularly accountability assessment, [which] is fundamentally behavioristic" (Johnston, 1997). Teachers may be caught in a web between competing expectations, trying to responsibly balance the demands of all the stakeholders (administrators, parents, professional organizations) and the needs of their individual students. This may be especially evident in districts that, under close scrutiny to improve performance on high stakes assessment, attempt to control most aspects of teachers' assessment and curriculum practices.

References

Applebee, A. (1996). Curriculum as conversation. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Brophy, J. (1992). The *de facto* national curriculum in US elementary social studies: Critique of a representative example. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 24, 401-447.

Glaser, B. & Strauss, (1967). The discovery of grounded theory.

Hoff, D. (1997). Goals 2000 loses its way on standards. Education Week, 16, 1, 16.

Johnston, P. (1997). Performance assessment and the English Language Arts Standards. The Language and Literacy Spectrum, 7, 23-26.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1996). Don't know much about history: The pros and cons of social studies and literacy integration. Paper presented at the National Reading Conference, Charleston, SC.

Mathison, S. (1988). Why triangulate? Educational Researcher,17, 13-17.

McMahon, S. (1997). Conceptual issues associated with integrated instruction. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL, March 26, 1997.

National Council for the Social Studies. (1994). Curriculum standards for Social Studies. Washington, DC: Author.

National Council of Teachers of English & International Reading Association (1996). Standards for the English Language Arts. Urbana Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.

New York State Education Department. (January, 1996). Learning Standards for English Language Arts, Revised Edition. Albany,NY:Author.

New York State Education Department. (June 9, 1995). Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment: Preliminary Draft Framework. Albany, NY:Author.

New York State Education Department. (nd). Curriculum and Assessment Report from the State Education Department. Albany,NY: Author.

US Department of Education. (June 3, 1994). Goals 2000: How the New Voluntary National Standards Will Improve Education. Washington, DC: Author.

Figure 1

Standard 3 from the IRA/NCTE Standards:

> Students apply a wide range of strategies to comprehend, interpret, evaluate, and appreciate texts. They draw on their prior experience, their interactions with other readers and writers, their knowledge of word meaning and other texts, their word identification strategies, and their understanding of textual features (e.g., sound-letter correspondence, sentence structure, context, graphics). (Standards for the English Language Arts, 1996)

A "Performance Indicator" under Standard 1, Elementary Level, from the New York State Department of Education's Learning Standards for English Language Arts:

> Students make appropriate and effective use of strategies to construct meaning from print, such as prior knowledge about a subject, structural and context clues, and an understanding about letter-sound relationships to decode difficult words.

From Elementary Education in Factory City (September, 1996), a publication of the Factory City School District; Grade 4, Reading and Literature:

> Major areas of study will include:
> • applying study skills including use of reference books and interpretation of diagrams, charts, and graphs
> • expanding vocabulary, decoding, and phonics skills

Figure 2

From Goals, Benchmarks, and Performance Assessments, K-2 (November, 1996), a Goals 2000 Inquiry Project of the Tannersville School District:

Kindergarten: Writers/Speakers

Kindergarten Students Will:

Language Arts Goals	Grade Level Benchmarks	Performance Assessments
Understand that writing is a means of communication	• use pictures and print to convey a message • write upper and lower case letters • use sound spelling • use language experiences, dramatic expression, music and movement • respond to literature and experience	• anecdotal records • word lists • K-1 Assessment Pilot • journals • audio/video tapes • writing samples • dramatic interpretations • discussions

Figure 3

From K-4 Language Arts Program Goals and Grade Level Indicators, Southtown Central Schools (1996):

Readers/Listeners Grade 4

Fourth Grade Students Will:

Language Arts Goals	Grade Level Indicators	Possible Sources of Evidence
View reading as an active process using experiences and strategies to construct meaning	• read for meaning • reread when text does not make sense • self-correct errors • use context • demonstrate understanding of characters, events and facts • make and confirm predictions about text • compare/contrast, draw conclusions, and verify information from text • identify and summarize main ideas and facts from text • understand use of figurative language • skim to locate pertinent information • relate experiences to reading • respond critically to literature • increase fluency • develop and expand vocabulary	• running records • response journals • anecdotal records • discussion • dramatic discussions • illustrations • published materials • notes • teacher-designed materials • projects • personal dictionaries

Appendix

NEW YORK STATE STANDARDS FOR SOCIAL STUDIES

1. History of the United States and New York

Students will use a variety of intellectual skills to demonstrate their understanding of major ideas, eras, themes, developments, and turning points in the history of the United States and New York.

2. World History

Students will use a variety of intellectual skills to demonstrate their understanding of the major ideas, eras, themes, developments, and turning points in world history and examine the broad sweep of history from a variety of perspectives.

3. Geography

Students will use a variety of intellectual skills to demonstrate their understanding of the geography of the interdependent world in which we live - local, national, and global - including the distribution of people, places, and environments over the earth's surface.

4. Economics

Students will use a variety of intellectual skills to demonstrate their understanding of how the United States and other societies develop economic systems and associated institutions to allocate scarce resources, how major decision-making units function in the United States and other national economies, and how an economy solves the scarcity problem through market and nonmarket mechanisms.

5. Civics, Citizenship, and Government

Students will use a variety of intellectual skills to demonstrate their understanding of the necessity for establishing governments; the governmental system of the United States and other nations; the United States Constitution; the basic civic values of American constitutional democracy; and the roles, rights, and responsibilities of citizenship, including avenues of participation.

In the Standards document, each Standard is outlined for three levels; elementary, intermediate, and commencement. Each Standard has two to four "key ideas," that define the standard, and under each key idea category there are performance indicators and sample tasks given.

Appendix

NEW YORK STATE STANDARDS FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS

1. Students will read, write, listen, and speak for information and understanding.

As listeners and readers, students will collect data, facts, and ideas; discover relationships, concepts, and generalizations; and use knowledge generated from oral, written, and electronically produced texts. As speakers and writers, they will use oral and written language to acquire, interpret, apply, and transmit information.

2. Students will read, write, listen, and speak for literary response and expression.

Students will read and listen to oral, written, and electronically produced texts and performances, relate texts and performances to their own lives, and develop an understanding of the diverse social, historical, and cultural dimensions the texts and performances represent. As Speakers and writers, students will use oral and written language for self-expression and artistic creation.

3. Students will read, write, listen, and speak for critical analysis and evaluation.

As listeners and readers, students will analyze experiences, ideas, information, and issues presented by others using a variety of established criteria. As speakers and writers, they will present, in oral and written language and from a variety of perspectives, their opinions and judgments on experiences, ideas, information, and issues.

4. Students will read, write, listen, and speak for social interaction.

Students will use oral and written language for effective social communication with a wide variety of people. As readers and listeners, they will use the social communications of others to enrich their understanding of people and their views.

Each Standard is outlined for three levels; elementary, intermediate, and commencement. For each standard, the key ideas, performance indicators, and examples of evidence are listed first for the receptive language skills of listening and reading, then for the expressive language skills of speaking and writing.

Table 1.
TEACHERS' STANCE TOWARDS STANDARDS

	Responsibility		Teachers' Projects
	High Stakes Outcomes	Curriculum& Assessment Development	
Tannersville (N=7)	Teachers'	Teachers' (Goals 2000) State PEPs	K-1 Assessment
Factory City (N=7)	Teachers'	District-Mandated Texts Groups Standards State PEPs	Integrated LA Curriculum
Hudson Falls (N=2)	Teachers'	District-Mandated Standards DRPs State PEPS	Multi-Age Groups
Southtown (N=5)	Teachers'	Teachers' (Instructional Councils) State PEPs	Alternative LA Assessment LA Framework